



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,545	03/08/2002	So Young Bae	HI-0075	8820
34610	7590	07/28/2006	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			O'STEEN, DAVID R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	
DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/092,545	BAE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David R. O'Steen	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 March 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4-17-2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Note to Applicant

1. Art Units 2611, 2614 and 2617 have changed to 2623. Please make all future correspondence indicate the new designation 2623.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maybury (US 6,961,954).

As regards Claim 18, Maybury discloses an article-based news video content browsing system comprising: means for summarizing a news video content by arranging information (such as a key frame) representing at least one news article of the news video content together with information (such as key words) summarizing the contents of the news article (see a story under story index, fig. 16); means for providing a user with summarized contents of the news article as a browsing interface (fig. 16 and

col. 17, lines 1-8); and means for playing and displaying a specific section the user wants to get from the provided browsing interface (col. 17, lines 11-19).

As regards Claim 19, Maybury further discloses that any one of the information representing an article of the news video or summary information of the news video is generated by performing any one of selection or combination operation with respect to at least one of an anchor key frame, an episode key frame, a text key frame and a news icon (such as the anchor key frame of the top middle story, fig. 16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maybury (US 6,961,954) in view of Shastri (US 6,845,485).

As regards Claim 1, Maybury discloses a method of summarizing a news video content based on a news article, comprising the steps of: a) dividing the news video content on the basis of a news article unit; (fig. 1.26, and col. 10, lines 30-32); b) extracting an anchor key frame, an episode key frame (such as a reporter segment) (col. 7, lines 21-24), and a text key frame (cols. 15 and 16, lines 61-67 and 1-2) associated with a corresponding news article from the news video content divided on the basis of news article units (it is well know that many news story segments include

both anchor segments and reporter segments, cols. 15, lines 30-36); indexing the text key frame as summary elements for representing the news article (summary, fig. 19) but fails to disclose indexing both the anchor key frame and the episode key frame. Shastri discloses indexing both the anchor key frame and the episode key frame (which could be included among the many key frames used to summarize the story, fig. 4.202).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the indexing of elements, as done in Shastri, an analogous art, to the news article summarization method of Maybury to provide the user with a better representation of the story than just showing one key frame.

As regards Claims 2, 7, and 14, Maybury discloses d) extracting a news icon (such as an key frame from a news summary segment or the beginning of the news segment, col. 15, lines 36-44) as an element for summarizing the news article as well as the anchor key frame, the episode key frame and the text key frame; and e) storing the extracted news icon as an image to generate a news icon key frame; wherein the generated news icon key frame is used as an additional summary element for summarizing the news article (such as the key frame in the top left corner of fig. 16, or the key frame at the lower bottom corner of fig. 16).

As regards Claims 3 and 8, Maybury discloses that the anchor key frame is extracted from an anchor shot of the news article (col. 8, lines 17-24).

As regards Claims 4 and 9, Maybury discloses that the episode key frame is extracted from an episode scene within the news article and represents the episode scene (col. 8, lines 17-22).

As regards Claim 5 and 10, Maybury discloses that the text key frame is a summary that key texts scattered in the news article and representative of contents of the news article (cols. 15 and 16, lines 61-67 and 1-2) are synthesized in an image (see summary, fig. 19).

As regards Claims 6 and 13, Maybury discloses an article-based news video content browsing system comprising: means for providing summarized news video contents for each news article using summary elements including an anchor key frame, an episode key frame (such as a reporter segment) (col. 7, lines 21-24), and a text key frame (cols. 15 and 16, lines 61-67 and 1-2); means for displaying summary contents of the news video content (fig. 16 and col. 17, lines 1-8); input means (such as by clicking in a graphical user interface environment) for enabling a user to browse and select the news article using the display means (cols. 16 and 17, lines 35-46 and 11-19); and means for playing a specific news article using the display means if the news article is selected by the user (fig. 20 and col. 17, lines 11-19) but fails to disclose that the displaying is summarized using the summary elements (namely both the anchor key frame and the episode key frame). Shastri discloses that the displaying is summarized using the summary elements (which could be included among the many key frames used to summarize the story, fig. 4.202).

As regards Claims 11 and 16, Maybury discloses that the browsing interface is displayed in such as way that the summary elements of each of the news articles are arranged in a corresponding part of the display area (fig. 17).

As regards Claim 12, Maybury and Shastri both disclose that the news articles are arranged on one axis of abscissa and ordinate axes of the display area, and summary elements of each news article are arranged on the other axis. Both Maybury and Shastri present summaries of news articles which include key frames and text summaries such as Maybury, fig. 19 and Shastri, fig. 4. Both also disclose laying key frames out in a grid fashion, for example, Maybury, fig. 17 and Shastri, fig. 4.202. It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the presentations of Maybury and Shastri such a way to that the news articles are arranged on one axis of abscissa and ordinate axes of the display area, and summary elements of each news article are arranged on the other axis so that the user has easy access to summary information for each story.

As regards Claim 15, please see the U.S.C. 103 rejections for claims 3 through 5.

As regards Claim 17, Maybury further discloses that the video content is presented from a play reopening start position that is a beginning position of the selected news article when user requests a play of selected news article (col. 17, lines 11-19).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Elenbaas (US 2005/0028194) discloses a news retrieval system with segment identification, classification, and presentation. H. Zhang discloses a

general key frame extraction system which also includes key frame classification.


Ceccarelli (WO 98/34182) discloses a key frames navigation means which also includes capturing text from a screen.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David R. O'Steen whose telephone number is 571-272-7931. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DRO


CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600